

REMARKS

The present application was filed on June 15, 2000 with claims 1-14. Claims 1-17 are pending, and claims 1, 8, 12 and 15 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated July 1, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,164,975 to Weingarden et al. (hereinafter “Weingarden”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,331 to Alexander (hereinafter “Alexander”).

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weingarden in view of Alexander, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 15. Specifically independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 15 have been amended to recite that a profile comprises a plurality of numeric entries, each numeric entry representing a learning mode. The highest numeric entry of the profile is indicative of an optimum mode of learning. Support for the amendments can be found on pages 3-5 of the specification. The combination of Weingarden and Alexander fails to disclose a profile having a plurality of numeric entries that each represent an individual learning mode. The combination also fails to disclose that the highest of these numeric entries is indicative of an optimum learning mode.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 15, respectively. Dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 also recite patentable subject matter in their own right.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-17 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547

Date: October 28, 2004